

Administration Team Agenda

Date: November 18, 2005

Time: 9:00am

Place: Tacoma AGC Building

| | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| <u>Attending</u> | Mark Borton____ | Tim Hayner_x | Cathy Nicholas_____ |
| | Jerry Brais_____ | Roger Palfener__x | Ken Olson_x |
| | Forrest Dill__x | David Jones_____ | Mark Rohde_____ |
| | Bob Glenn_____ | David Mariman_____ | Mark Scoccolo_x |
| | Paul Gonseth_____ | Craig McDaniel_x | Dave Standahl_____ |
| | Mike Hall_____ | Tina Nelson__x | Greg Waugh__x |
| | Tom Zamzow_____ | | |

Opening Greg Waugh & Craig McDaniel

Introductions Roger Palfener, representing Totem Electric, officially joined the team.

Opening, Minutes, Misc Business Minutes from October 2005, were accepted as is.

Fuel Cost Adjustment: Craig McDaniel handed out the fuel cost adjustment specification for SR 520 to Sahalee Way Widening & Channelization Stage 2. WSDOT elected to put this provision in, due to the anticipated cost of fuel, consumption and long duration (945 working days). This is the only job that WSDOT plans to put this provision in at this time. You will find the Fuel Cost Adjustments **attached**.

Craig McDaniel solicited feedback on:

1. Rolling items up into a lump sum, for landscape - the concept on rolling up unit priced landscaped items into a lump sum.
 - Tina mentioned that a lot of cities already pay for landscaping in a lump sum.
 - Mark Scoccolo pointed out that lump sum would make it more complicated to make minor modifications.
 - In conclusion, a good lump sum break down developed under contract will mitigate most of the disadvantages of paying a lump sum.

Action Items: Based on the input, Craig is going to consider this method on a case by case basis provided the scope of the landscaping is well defined. Mark and Greg are going to talk to landscaping sub-contractors and bring back additional feedback to the next meeting.

2. Upset Pricing.

- There was a concern that the engineer's estimate is not detailed enough to determine a realistic upset price.
- The contractor's perception is that they are being asked to perform a detailed estimate with out compensation. They don't mind doing so, but feel that they need to be compensated for this service possibly as a stipend.

- Mark S. is considering promoting legislation prohibiting a current, regular practice (by a limited number of smaller owners) of pricing jobs by soliciting bids and rescoping based on dollars

Lead Team: Greg and Craig discussed the purpose and subject matter of the November 10th Lead Team Meeting. The Admin Team was assigned the task of discussing the need and effectiveness of Partnering.

Partnering: (state and contractors relationship on the job) Are we hearing of more problems? Partner at the beginning of the job? Partner later in the job?

Opinions were expressed with regard to what is leading to working relationship problems:

- New PEs tend to interpret the contract as black and white
- Timely decisions, contractors want to meet and negotiate with people that have the confidence and delegated authority to make a decision.
- It was suggested that partnering needs to happen on a regular basis and be followed up with regular maintenance sessions.
- Contractors feel that there is a lack of communication when it comes to what the designer was thinking.
- Contractors feel that turn over with in the state agency is a problem; it makes a difficult job more challenging.
- It was suggested that quarterly meetings facilitated by a single neutral third person to reduce the costs of a three member DRB. This is a popular suggestion with the group.
- It was suggested that DRBs could be shared between more than one contract with the same contractor to reduce costs.
- It is important to local agencies that quarterlies or other efforts be consider at the beginning of the project and not under contract so the cost can be figured into the project budget.

The team discussed several efforts that they have found beneficial and made general suggestions for application as follows:

- Start of the job partnering, moderate value for new managers on larger contracts
- Award for Contracting Excellence, good incentive as a catalyst for establishing lines of communication and resolving issues
- Collaborative Contract Administration put on by Ron Howard and Bill Ott, Great for new PEs and contract managers
- Intervention Partnering, necessary on are occasions, as needed
- Independent third party mentoring, Could be a role for DRB a member but not everyone was comfortable with it.
- Ongoing partnering - teambuilding, communication decision-making, morale-monitoring

- DOT contract administration training, (dispute resolution, communication, decision making, etc), This would be very beneficial and is especially necessary for new PE's

Action Item: Craig will keep the team informed on what is being done or proposed by the WSDOT with regard to partnering.

Craig shared a handout put together by Moe, State Const. Engineer for Bridge and relayed the **attached** information. The following are general comments with regard to the information

- The described cure boxes are expensive
- One disadvantage is that powder coating is harder to patch. Another disadvantage mentioned it that powder coated products especially large ones such as sign bridges are damaged during shipping.
- Formwork for self compacting concrete is expensive because limited construction joints are allowed.

December Construction Manual Revisions: Craig mentioned that revisions will be coming out with regard to material on hand and material acceptance. **See attached**

Meeting Adjourned at noon